```
Mal2JacC kjc
     UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
1
     SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
 2
 3
     UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
                                             New York, N.Y.
                                             22 Cr. 352 (JSR)
 4
                V.
5
     SEQUAN JACKSON,
6
                    Defendant.
 7
           ----x Conference
 8
                                              October 21, 2022
                                              3:50 p.m.
9
10
     Before:
11
                           HON. JED S. RAKOFF,
12
                                              District Judge
13
14
                                APPEARANCES
15
     DAMIAN WILLIAMS
          United States Attorney for the
16
          Southern District of New York
17
     BY: RUSHMI BHASKARAN
          ADAM S. HOBSON
18
          Assistant United States Attorneys
19
     SUSAN G. KELLMAN
20
          Attorney for Defendant
21
22
     Also Present:
23
     Marlon Ovalles, Pretrial Services Officer, SDNY
24
     Chris La Tronica, Esq.
25
```

(Case called)

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Will everyone please be seated and will the parties please identify themselves for the record.

MS. BHASKARAN: Good afternoon, your Honor. Rushmi Bhaskaran and Adam Hobson for the government. We are joined at counsel table by Marlon Ovalles of Pretrial Services.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

MS. KELLMAN: Good afternoon, your Honor. Susan

Kellman and, your Honor, I am assisted at counsel table by

Chris La Tronica. Mr. La Tronica is a member of the Eastern

District -- I hate to say those words here, but the Eastern

District mentoring program, and we have been trading back and

forth since we all have a lot of trials. I will write to your

Honor and explain a little bit more about that, but that is why

he is at counsel table.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. KELLMAN: He is assisting me.

THE COURT: Okay. We are here for the request for release on bail. Before I hear from counsel, in the submissions that I received from Ms. Kellman, there was one thing that struck me as very contrary to what I had previously been told, and that is that "much of the discovery has not yet even been produced." That's a quote from her letter.

Now, this case began some months ago. At that time the government indicated that it was promptly turning over the

discovery. At a subsequent conference, the government represented that all discovery had been turned over. In addition, at the request of defense counsel, the Court had appointed a discovery coordinator who also represented explicitly to the Court that all discovery had been turned over to defense counsel, along with her analyses of much of the discovery that of course would ease the burden of any new counsel getting into the case.

Now, this was all before you were appointed because your client wanted new counsel and I granted that request. But given those representations, I don't understand. Are you sure you haven't received all discovery?

MS. KELLMAN: No, I have not received any discovery,
Judge. But just to fill in the Court, and I will start from
when I was assigned, I reached out to Mr. Cecutti or he reached
out to me and he told me that he hadn't yet received any
discovery. So I reached out to -- any discovery. So I reached
out to the coordinator, and she told me that she had just put
it in the overnight mail to all of the lawyers and that they
should be getting it over the weekend. And so as soon as
Mr. Cecutti got it -- I believe she also sent me a copy, but by
Monday I had two copies of it, but I hadn't had any at the
time.

THE COURT: Okay. But you have had it.

MS. KELLMAN: That's the first production. I think it

is the first three productions. But since then, your Honor, including, I think, up to yesterday, we have been getting discovery on an ongoing basis, on a rolling basis and it is not an insignificant amount of discovery. It includes a tremendous amount of phone data --

THE COURT: Well, of course, you may recall that in part — this is before you were in the case, but if you examine the record, before the current trial date was set for your client and several others, the Court, based on, among other things, the volume of discovery and also the schedule of various counsel and so forth, had scheduled a trial for May 1, and that date is still available to you and your client if you want it. But he didn't want it. He said, no, I want a speedy trial. And I questioned him and the others who so requested it. I said: You understand that although, in my view, from what I understand of the case, counsel can be prepared to try this case, they would be even more prepared if they had all the way to May. And he said, yes, he understood that, but he still wanted the earlier trial date. So some of this is, I think, implicit in the choices he made.

However, let me ask the government.

MS. KELLMAN: Your Honor, if I may add one thing?

THE COURT: Yes.

MS. KELLMAN: At the time, of course, he said that, I believe they didn't have any discovery. There was still no

discovery had been produced. But now, as I said, we have gotten the first production. But the first production is really critical in a respect because when the coordinator, the discovery coordinator turned it over, she had downloaded a significant portion of it with a program that nobody I knew could open. And I had a young lawyer who works for me spend an entire day downloading it. It took all day to download, and then it didn't work. And so we have had a tremendous amount of difficulty. I didn't try it myself because I wouldn't have been able to.

THE COURT: Because lawyers are not technologically adept.

MS. KELLMAN: But the young ones are. And then when she couldn't do it, I turned it over to my daughter, who is a video expert. So she did open it eventually. But we had to use a different computer and a different program, and it took almost three days to just open the material, forget going through it. Now, that isn't to say that my client can open it at the jail. In a million years he couldn't open it.

THE COURT: So but I didn't understand you to be making an application for an adjournment based on all --

MS. KELLMAN: I'm not.

THE COURT: You are not.

MS. KELLMAN: My client still would like to go to trial --

THE COURT: Very good.

MS. KELLMAN: -- notwithstanding our ability to go through all of the discovery.

THE COURT: The other logistical problem -- I do want to hear from the government about discovery in a minute, but the other logistic problem you mentioned was problems getting access to him. So this is a frequent problem. My policy, which, again, because you were new you probably didn't hear me say this, but I have said it in virtually every case where a trial is looming, if you can't get adequate access to your client, you and the government then need to call me and I will call the warden. And last I checked, the warden has some say in these things.

MS. KELLMAN: Some say.

THE COURT: No, indeed, every time I have made this request to a warden, that has solved the problem. Because the warden understands that the case has to be given priority because of the looming trial.

So I am happy to do that if you continue to have problems at the MDC.

 $\,$  MS. KELLMAN: I think that would be -- I'm assuming that we still have the option of bail, but assuming that we don't --

THE COURT: Of course if I grant bail, this is all moot.

MS. KELLMAN: This is academic, of course. But on the off chance that we need it, I will say that we have had quite a bit of difficulty just getting — there is a new rule at the MDC that says now you can bring in a laptop. You just have to fill out a form and you go in and you take the laptop, which is great, because my client can't open the discovery himself. Then we can bring it in and we can show it to him on the laptop, except for one thing, they don't let you in when you have it. You have to fill out the form, and now it has to be approved. Well, it is already approved. It is preapproved. We have gone through this every single —

THE COURT: I don't want to take all day on -MS. KELLMAN: I hear you.

THE COURT: -- this side issue. My very simple-minded approach is to call the warden and say, Make it work, and it always succeeds.

MS. KELLMAN: There you go. Thank you.

THE COURT: Now, what's the story on discovery?

MS. BHASKARAN: Your Honor, we stand by all of our prior representations about the production of discovery. It was substantially produced to the discovery coordinator by the deadline set by the Court. I believe it was August 16 or thereabouts. It then took the discovery coordinator several weeks to get that discovery to defense counsel. But as your Honor noted, discovery counsel got the discovery to defense

counsel.

Me continue to make productions as we receive material. It is in our possession, and we push it out as soon as we can. The materials that we are pushing out now are electronic devices that were seized at the time of the takedown in this matter. It takes time to be able to actually get into those devices. Sometimes they are password protected. That takes time. Once we extract them, we are just pushing these out to defense counsel without even reviewing them ourselves, quite frankly. We are just getting the data out as soon as possible. We are then following up with sets of identified data from those devices so defense counsel knows the material that we think is actually responsive to our search warrants.

THE COURT: Why are you only getting this material now?

 $\,$  MS. BHASKARAN: It is a matter -- these devices are in the hands of technicians who --

THE COURT: Yes, and you knew that from day one. So my question is, what steps have you taken to say to the technicians: This is not just another matter. This is a matter in which it is critical that discovery be produced as promptly as possible, and you have a choice, you can either put more hands on it and get it quicker, or you can come in to Judge Rakoff's courtroom and find out whether you should be held in contempt?

MS. BHASKARAN: Your Honor, some of these devices are in fact password protected, so it's a matter of hooking them up to a machine and the machine trying to crack them open. But we have communicated to our agents the urgency of the production of these materials, to be able to extract them and turn them over.

THE COURT: What's your worst-case scenario as to when you can totally, completely finish discovery?

(Counsel confer)

MS. BHASKARAN: Your Honor, there are still certain devices that we have yet to get into because they are password protected and the machine has not cracked into them yet. So perhaps we will never get into those devices and we will not use them.

THE COURT: Well, all right. Here is what I think makes sense. Any discovery that you intend to use in any respect must be produced by a week from today no matter what. Anything produced thereafter cannot be used by the government. Understood?

MS. BHASKARAN: Understood, your Honor.

THE COURT: Very good.

All right. Now let's talk about bail. So Ms. Kellman, we are back to you.

MS. KELLMAN: You may have taken away a lot of my motivation, but I will persevere.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The reality is, Judge, that preparing with our client has been very, very difficult. He has difficulty -- even assuming that the warden makes every accommodation and we can get in and we can see him as often as we would like, he can't review the discovery separately and we can't sit in the jail all day and all night reviewing the discovery.

THE COURT: Yeah, but he knew all that when he made the choice. This is déjà vu as far as I'm concerned. It was his choice, which I totally understand, that he, rather than sit in jail for many more months, would rather go forward. even, in his initial application, said that he was directing his counsel to withdraw any motions and not to file any pretrial motions. And I explained to him and to all the people who are going forward that that could -- those motions could be very helpful to the defense, they could narrow the evidence, they could narrow the charges. One of the defendants said, well, he had heard through the other people at the MDC that those motions rarely succeed. I told him that was not true in my court. I also explained to him that I thought he might want to reconsider relying for legal advice on people whose legal advice is so good that they are sitting there in jail. And so but he -- all of this was explained, and so I will -- why don't you do this. If you can reach the warden today after we conclude this proceeding—and that may not be possible because it is late—but you and the government should try jointly to

reach him, and if you do reach him, explain that this is -- and I don't call him about every case, but I call him about cases like this, that we want to make arrangements to get much greater access to your client. This is assuming I deny your motion. If I grant your motion --

MS. KELLMAN: Which I can't imagine, but just in the off chance, yes, Judge.

THE COURT: If that doesn't have any effect or if he doesn't say, well, you know, okay, or something like that, then call me first thing Monday morning and I will call him before noon Monday.

MS. KELLMAN: Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: All right. And that should be a joint call with the government.

MS. KELLMAN: Of course.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. KELLMAN: The bail application.

THE COURT: Back to -- yes.

MS. KELLMAN: I would start with the fact that, as I am sure your Honor knows, Pretrial Services did recommend that Mr. Jackson be released on bond --

THE COURT: Yes, I saw that.

MS. KELLMAN: -- and believed that there was a condition or a set of conditions that would guarantee -- that would both protect the community and also guarantee his

appearance in court.

The Pretrial Service agency recommended three financially responsible cosigners. We have offered six to your Honor. They are all people who have immediate connections to this defendant—his mother, his father, his girlfriend, a friend of his who's been a dear friend since they were children in elementary school. All of them work. All of them have good jobs. I have listed their employment for your Honor, but they are mental health workers, and a —

THE COURT: Yes, and I am sure that satisfactory people could be found. This, of course, would have to be subject to being checked out by the government, but I am assuming, and as I read your letter, you are also, although it's not your first preference, you are also willing to have home confinement and electronic monitoring if that is the route the Court wishes to go.

MS. KELLMAN: Correct, your Honor. And I would also say that we have -- we are certainly prepared to limit his ability to travel, although he does also have a job offer --

THE COURT: That's why I say it is not your first preference.

MS. KELLMAN: Because if he could work, that would obviously be helpful to his family. But it seems to me that of course we will have easier access to him and he will be able —for us, in this short amount of time, to prepare appropriately

for the case and Pretrial, which is tasked with making a determination as to whether or not they think he can be secure and protect the community at the same time, that we would ask your Honor to consider that, as I know you will.

But also my client had a number of -- wait. Two things. One, with respect to the bail itself, I have before I put this application together, your Honor, asked every one of the potential cosigners for their -- a copy of their work identification so I could confirm that they were in fact working, a copy of tax returns they filed last year or their W-2s, and their bank statement, so I have gotten all the --

THE COURT: What about -- as I say, I'm confident that you can satisfy that particular prong, but what about danger to the community?

MS. KELLMAN: Well, if he is locked at home, Judge -THE COURT: Well --

MS. KELLMAN: -- and it seems to me that we would cut down the same amount of difficulty as if we are talking about -- I assume the only thing we are talking about is using the phone, because he won't be able to leave the house and he will have GPS monitoring, so your Honor and Pretrial will know where he is at all times. But if we were able to secure his person in the house, then I would suggest he has probably the same access to the telephone that he has at the MDC, so I don't see how being in or out further that level of protection. He

can make --

THE COURT: All right. Let me take the liberty of interrupting and hear from the government.

MS. BHASKARAN: Thank you, your Honor.

We believe that continued detention is appropriate here because of the danger to the community that this defendant presents. He is the second defendant on the indictment. That was a meaningful choice. He was Jatiek Smith's lieutenant, and he was one of the leaders of this very violent conspiracy that extorted the fire mitigation industry. He not just knew about the violence that the First Response enterprise was perpetrating on this industry, he directed it, and at least on one instance he participated in that violence. And so he is instrumental to this enterprise being able to take over the industry through violence and through extortion. He in fact we believe brought in Jatiek Smith into the industry after Smith left jail. Mr. Jackson was working in the industry before then. And he became Jatiek Smith's trusted lieutenant. They, we understand —

THE COURT: The question is not — what you are saying is highly relevant, but the question is why, if he were subject to home confinement and electronic monitoring, he would still present a danger to the community in the four weeks or so, well, five weeks or so before trial.

MS. BHASKARAN: This is a defendant that the evidence

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

will show can do quite a lot of damage and danger just with his As the Court is probably aware, for just a two-month phone. period in our investigation we had a wire on two phones. One of those phones was Mr. Jackson's phone. And while we were up on a wire, Jackson called one of his subordinates and told that subordinate to go make a show of authority against an industry participant that was not abiding by the First Response rules. What happened to that participant was that he was later assaulted by several individuals. Those individuals, we believe, were associated with First Response. After being assaulted, they took the victim's identification card and took a photograph of it, which was an obvious effort to intimidate that witness from speaking to the police. So, your Honor, yes, even if he is stuck at home, we believe that he could do quite a decent amount of damage just by using the phone. He is a member of the Bloods. He had Blood literature in his home at the time of his arrest. He had two firearms in a lockbox underneath his bed with his passport. So we think that speaks volumes to who he is. He could do quite a lot of damage with the phone, your Honor.

THE COURT: Let me hear finally from defense counsel.

MS. KELLMAN: Well, your Honor, just with respect to the government's comments, of course I assume—and I think safely, though I don't like to assume—that those guns are no longer in my client's home and his passport of course would be

one of the conditions would have to be surrendered. So --

THE COURT: No. The point, the general point that the government is making is that your client has a history of helping organize acts of violence or attempted violence or threats of violence that have continued until quite recently and that even by having access to the phone and the other small amounts of opportunities presented, he could still exercise that in a way, for example, that might serve to intimidate witnesses.

So that is the gist of what they are arguing.

MS. KELLMAN: And my argument, Judge, again, is he has access to the telephone if he wants it at the jail, as well. And sadly, but truthfully, for \$50, anybody can use any cell phone that they want. The guards make them available on a minute-by-minute basis. I have clients asking me if they can have \$50 so they can text their relatives. I said I can't really be a part of that, thank you very much. But if he wanted to be doing that from the jail, he wouldn't have any difficulty doing that from the jail.

And also to the point of the subordinate, he may have well spoken to a subordinate. I wasn't there. I haven't heard a recording of that conversation. But what the subordinate did with his own judgment and the decision that the subordinate made, we don't know if Mr. Jackson told him to be violent or to threaten violence or if this was done on the subordinate's own

and maybe that subordinate was disciplined for taking action that Mr. Jackson thought was inappropriate. I don't know the details of that yet, and I will certainly learn them. But I think that to assume always that violence comes back to him, he had worked in the industry for quite a while before the charged period of the indictment, which starts actually many years after he's been in the industry without complaint —

THE COURT: Let me ask you this: Supposing the conditions of bail were home confinement 24/7 and no release except to meet with his attorneys, and that the -- either no telephone or calls that would be restricted solely to his attorney, which could then be themselves monitored, is that acceptable to you?

MS. KELLMAN: Is that at my direction --

THE COURT: Yes.

MS. KELLMAN: -- or the government's, your Honor?

Yes, I think that would be acceptable.

THE COURT: So let me go to the government. So if there is home confinement, electronic monitoring, he is not out at all for a job or anything else -- by the way, where is he going to be living?

MS. KELLMAN: Let me just make sure.

(Defense counsel and defendant confer)

MS. KELLMAN: Your Honor, my understanding is he would be living with his girlfriend on Metropolitan Avenue and they

have a son together as well, a two-year-old son, and he would be living there.

THE COURT: Okay. I want to ask the Pretrial Services person if this can be arranged, but some arrangement where both any existing telephone at that residence — well, period, that he can only use the existing telephone and that that would be monitored with the consent of the girlfriend, so that it could be detected who the calls were made to, and it would be limited to calls to his attorney and no one else. Why wouldn't that be sufficient protection against danger to the community?

MS. BHASKARAN: So, your Honor, for one thing, every phone — if the girlfriend has a phone, Mr. Jackson could have access to that. There could be other phones in the home that we don't know about that we can't find that are being used. Communication could be made not just from a landline, but more likely on the Internet, so Internet usage would need to be monitored. There are just many opportunities for someone to find a way to communicate with the outside world, and everyone in the household would — in order for this to work and to be enforceable, I would imagine that everyone in the household would have to be subject to this communication—less type of existence.

THE COURT: So you are right that it would have to be -- I gather there is only one other adult in the place and a two-year-old child. I think we can risk it with a two-year-old

child. So, yes, you would have to have the consent of the girlfriend, which might include—which she may not be willing to do—putting all of her electronic equipment subject to daily monitoring by the Pretrial Services.

Let me ask Pretrial Services, maybe I am talking about something that's not really feasible.

THE PROBATION OFFICER: I was thinking to myself -- good afternoon, your Honor, by the way.

My understanding of Pretrial Services, when it conducts monitoring of electronic devices, it is usually limited for those defendants that are being charged in sex offense cases, such as child pornography, where we do install a program that lets us know what websites are being visited, what images are being viewed.

I think what's being discussed here is something similar to a wire being listened in to or checking the defendant's phone for text messages and things of that nature. To my understanding, your Honor, Pretrial does not have the capability of conducting the monitoring that is being discussed this afternoon. However, I can confirm that, but that's my understanding that we do not do that, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. So here is where I think I come out.

I think the main danger here is danger to the community, and there is, I'm sorry to say—this has nothing to

do with the defendant per se—there is a long history in this court of persons in similar groups, like the Bloods, of not only violence, but witness intimidation, and that is a very great concern to the Court with a trial coming up so soon.

Nevertheless, if a methodology could be worked out where in fact it would be the functional equivalent of his being in a cell, where, for example, the phone calls are recorded, but it would be in his home or his girlfriend's home, where he could have much more complete access to his counsel, I think that would be arguably acceptable to the Court. And the reason I am phrasing it that way, and I am sorry it is a Friday afternoon, but I think what counsel jointly needs to do have a discussion on Monday with Pretrial Services and explain to them that the Court is at least arguably amenable to a release so that there can be greater contact with counsel and greater preparation for trial, provided that there are enough safeguards to genuinely prevent against even the possibility of witness intimidation or other violence, and then we will reconvene.

And I'm sorry, because I see a lot of fine people came down here today, but I think it is to everyone's benefit that I not make this ruling until I know exactly what is or is not possible. So we will reconvene — and after you have had that discussion with Pretrial Services, jointly call my chambers and we will figure out — I have a trial starting Monday, but we

```
Mal2JacC kjc
      will find a way to squeeze things in. All right?
1
2
               So the motion technically is denied for now but very
3
     much open to --
 4
               MS. KELLMAN: Or held in abeyance.
5
               THE COURT: Or held in abeyance. That's even better.
6
      I like that. Very good. Thanks.
 7
               MS. KELLMAN: Thank you, your Honor.
8
                                    000
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```